

16834

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 29

Carolina; Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, of North Carolina; Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee; Senator HERBERT S. WALTERS, of Tennessee; Senator SMATHERS, of Florida.

Over and over, week after week, the most convincing and most conclusive case was made against the force scheme projected in the name of civil rights. The long series of southern speeches presented irrefutable arguments against the scheme.

Yet the forces of Federal force were so relentless and unreasoning in the use of their overwhelming numerical strength that 4 days before the final Senate vote. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia, who cast one of the total of 27 votes against the bill, protested in a speech.

"The bipartisan steamroller crushes all who would stand in its path, and as the command rings out, 'Damn the amendments—full speed ahead.'"

Today, as surely as when the forces of Federal force were driving the bill full speed ahead to enactment, the southern stand has the deepest gratitude of all Americans, who adequately appreciate a magnificent public service in freedom's cause.

And, so it should be and will be down through time.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKE-SHORE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Chicago's American spoke for millions of people in the Midwest, I am certain, when in an editorial on Monday it welcomed the approval by a Senate subcommittee of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

The editorial hails this action by the Subcommittee on Public Lands as a "major success" and "very encouraging." With solid understanding of the legislative gestation period, the editors note that the report of the subcommittee represents a victory in only one round of the battle, albeit an extremely important one. They have a right to be cautious; and, of course, they are correct, for Chicago's American—alone among Chicago's daily press, I am sorry to say—has year after year spoken out, in behalf of the people of the Midwest, to urge preservation of the beautiful and irreplaceable dunes. Without the support of this outstanding newspaper, the good prospects for saving the dunes would be nonexistent.

I ask unanimous consent that the Chicago's American editorial of July 27 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago American, July 27, 1964]

A VICTORY FOR THE DUNES

The long battle to save the Indiana dunes from mutilation has had a major success—not a complete one, but important enough to make the prospects very encouraging. A Senate Interior subcommittee Friday approved a compromise version of a bill to create a national lakeshore, which is about the same as a national park, covering 10,345 acres of the dunes area.

The boundaries were worked out by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, on one side and Indiana Senators BIRCH BAYH and VANCE HARTKE on the other. The goal was to safeguard the natural beauties and values of the dunes while allowing adequate space for industrial development near Burns Ditch, where two big steel companies

plan to build a harbor and a major steel-mill complex.

DOUGLAS hopes to get the bill through the full committee and onto the Senate floor this week. It may win approval this year, he believes, if it can be wrestled past the opposition of minority leader CHARLES A. HALLECK.

DOUGLAS has been a tireless battler in the cause of saving an irreplaceable natural asset from those who can't imagine why anything should be saved if it can profitably be ruined. In a telegram following Friday's vote, he thanked this newspaper for its help in the fight. It is we who thank him, and we wish him luck in the coming rounds.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 910, H.R. 8864; and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. H.R. 8864, an act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the pending bill, H.R. 8864.

Fourteen months ago the Senate approved a resolution ratifying the International Coffee Agreement.

I voted against that treaty on the ground that it would unfairly penalize the consumers of this country, that it would be, in effect, a regressive tax, falling most heavily upon the low and middle income families.

I also expressed grave doubt at the wisdom of our becoming the enforcing arm of a worldwide coffee cartel whose purpose was to put a floor, or minimum price under coffee—without the protection of a maximum price, or ceiling.

Nothing that has happened in the past 14 months has caused me to change my mind.

Consider, for example, the retail price of coffee.

When the Senate ratified the International Coffee Agreement in May of 1963, the retail price of a 1-pound can of coffee was 69 cents, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The latest Bureau of Labor Statistics figure on coffee—for the month of May 1964—is 82.8 cents per pound.

This is a 20-percent increase in 13 months, and we are not even yet a formal member of the International Coffee Agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a table detailing the retail price of coffee from 1953 through May 1964, prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. average annual retail prices
[U.S. cents per pound]

	Retail (regular coffee in can)
1953	89.2
1954	110.8
1955	93.0
1956	103.4
1957	101.7
1958	90.7
1959	78.0
1960	75.3
1961	73.6
1962	70.8
1963:	
January	69.2
February	69.1
March	68.7
April	68.7
May	69.0
June	69.5
July	69.6
August	69.8
September	69.6
October	69.7
November	69.8
December	70.1
1964:	
January	71.7
February	74.8
March	78.9
April	81.1
May	82.8

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I realize that there has been a severe crop failure in Brazil, which produces about 37 percent of the world's coffee.

But I reject the argument that this is the sole cause of the price increase, particularly when we know that Brazil, alone, now holds some 50 million bags of good coffee in safe, weatherproof warehouses and storage sheds. This exceeds the total, worldwide export quota for 1 year, as approved by the International Coffee Council.

The International Coffee Agreement approved a year ago last May, was not self-executing. It required enactment of the enabling legislation we are considering today.

Originally, we were told that this legislation had to be approved by December 31, 1963, or the treaty would expire. The Senate did not, however, act on this House-approved bill last year.

Despite this, the U.S. State Department, on December 27, 1963, deposited provisional articles of ratification.

We are now told that we must act so that the system of "certificates of origin"—which will control the imports of coffee and make the quota system of the cartel effective—can go into effect on October 1, 1964.

Although the treaty itself runs for 5 years, the enabling legislation we are asked to approve today would expire on October 1, 1965.

This fact, by itself, is a strong argument against the bill, since it would cover only the 1963-64 and 1964-65 crop years.

And proponents of the treaty concede that for the first time in years, world consumption of coffee will exceed world production.

This being the case, the law of supply and demand will eliminate the necessity for a price floor. Indeed, this has already taken place.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16835

Our joining the agreement would only serve to intensify the effects of this price increase upon the American consumer, since we would be bound by the quota imposed by the International Coffee Council.

Further, we would be prevented from easing the shortage from other sources, since the agreement rigidly limits the amount of coffee we could buy from coffee producing countries that are not members of the cartel.

We are assured by proponents of this legislation that if the United States finds this treaty too burdensome and expensive we can withdraw by giving 90 days notice.

Technically, this is true, even though the withdrawal procedure is somewhat cumbersome.

But realistically, it is virtually impossible to withdraw. As the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] points out in his eloquent dissenting views in the report:

We all know the moral and propaganda opprobrium which would be heaped upon us if we were to withdraw. We would be accused of breaking faith with the coffee exporting nations of the world, and the followers of Castro, Khrushchev, and Mao Tse-tung would seek to set all of Latin America against us. The honest nationalists of the countries affected would also be embittered and estranged.

He wisely concludes that "the possibility of an ultimate divorce should not lead us to contract an unsound marriage."

These same points apply to the argument that we can drop out next October if we do not like the way things are going.

Mr. President, when I voted against ratification of the International Coffee Agreement a year ago last May, I briefly explained my reasons for doing so.

At that time, I noted that during my entire time in the Senate, I had been a consistent supporter of the foreign aid programs and the policies of the administration, regardless of party. I believe that the Record will bear this out.

At that time also, I expressed a willingness to support the Alliance for Progress with a greater investment, if necessary, and have so demonstrated in subsequent votes. I am prepared to do so again in the future.

I am perfectly willing to continue to help Latin America through an Alliance for Progress—properly conducted—that will reach the people who need the help the most.

The funds for such a program will come from general revenue raised through a progressive income tax system—rather than a flat, regressive levy in the form of a coffee price increase that would hit hardest at low- and middle-income groups.

I said then, and still believe, that the International Coffee Agreement proposes to establish a worldwide cartel to clamp rigid controls on the movement of coffee and rig prices at an artificially high level.

In plain words, what it will do is make

this international pricefixing cartel an instrument of our foreign policy.

It asks the American coffee drinker who consumes more than 50 percent of the coffee of the world to underwrite the economy and subsidize the foreign exchange of the coffee-producing nations by paying an artificially high price for their product.

I felt then, and I feel now, that this coffee agreement would be another major step down the road to further international cartels, fixing prices and quantities on other products.

After coffee, it will be cocoa, and tea, and who knows where it will stop?

I am familiar with the arguments that the treaty has adequate safeguards against unreasonable price increases. But I find them no more persuasive now than I did 14 months ago, when coffee in the grocery store cost 20 percent less than it does now.

Therefore, I shall vote against this proposed legislation to implement the International Coffee Agreement.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

AID FOR CHILDREN OF UNEMPLOYED PARENTS—AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, H.R. 10199 (AMENDMENT NO. 1160)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee has once again voted to keep needy children of unemployed parents in the District of Columbia ineligible for welfare assistance. It is my intention by amendment to seek another opportunity again this year to have the Senate decide whether it approves of this result.

Last year, the issue was thoroughly discussed in an extensive debate. That discussion can be found at pages 20984-21126 of the Record of November 18, 1963.

The issue remains substantially the same. The District is not eligible to participate in a Federal program available to every State in the Union. Needy children of unemployed parents here are still going hungry. Fathers unable to find work are still under pressure to desert their wives and children so that their families will be eligible for welfare payments.

But this year, unlike last year, every single agency of Government with an interest in this problem, except the Senate Appropriations Committee, is in favor of providing the needed funds. These funds have the support of the President of the United States, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Director of Public Welfare for the District, the House Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives. I am hopeful they will also be supported by a majority of the Senate.

I submit an amendment to accomplish this purpose and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 30, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 29, 1964:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

James L. Greenfield, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Dr. George I. Mishtowt, of the District of Columbia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Robert S. Black, of the District of Columbia.

John W. Ford, of Virginia.

William K. Hitchcock, of Colorado.

Lee E. Metcalf, of Texas.

John L. Stegmaier, of the District of Columbia.

Irving G. Tragen, of California, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Mrs. Alice T. Curran, of New York.

Samuel R. Gammon III, of Texas.

Joseph Rand, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Martin H. Armstrong, of Washington.

Richard W. Berg, of New Hampshire.

Daniel Lee McCarthy, of Wisconsin.

Richard J. Gibson, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Evan R. Berlack, of New York.

Stephen M. Block, of Connecticut.

Donald I. Colin, of California.

Richard C. Devine, of New York.

Eugene Klebenov, of Massachusetts.

Richard L. McCormack, of Florida.

Charles F. Swezey, of New York.

Andrew Tangelos, of the District of Columbia.